

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The claims have been amended as set forth above. The specification has been amended to remedy minor errors. No new matter has been added.

#### **I. Examiner Interview May 22, 2007**

An Examiner Interview was held on May 22, 2007. During the interview, the claim amendments were discussed in light of the cited references. Applicants believe that an agreement was reached that the amendments overcome the current rejections. Examiner Dailey indicated that he would need to update his search.

#### **II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 has been amended as set forth above to overcome the rejection.

#### **III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-14, 16-17, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,181,781 issued to Porter (hereinafter "Porter") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0264654 published to Reding (hereinafter "Reding"). Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter in view of Reding and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,185 issued to Guthrie et al. (hereinafter "Guthrie"). Applicants respectfully disagree. As background and not for limiting the claims in any manner, the specification recites an example as follows:

Notification server 304 provides a link between the identifier associated with the event and the PUID associated with the subscriber. The telephone carrier uses the identifier, such as the subscriber's phone number, to identify an event. Notification server 304 uses the PUID to identify the subscriber. Notification server 304 is not aware of the subscriber associated with the identifier. When an event occurs at voice mail switch 308, notification server 304 correlates the identifier associated with the event to the corresponding PUID and then forwards the event to the PUID. Likewise, the telephone carrier does not store any PUID information. Thus, notification server 304 can bridge voice mail switch 308 to

web service interface 302 by mapping the subscriber's telephone number to the corresponding PUID.

The telephone carrier and web service interface 302 each recognize the subscriber via different string values, i.e., a phone number and a PUID. This feature provides the subscriber with flexibility in customizing the alerts service because notification server 304 can map one or more phone numbers to one or more PUIDs. For example, the subscriber can receive alerts at one location for events occurring at many different voice mail switches. Likewise, a subscriber can receive the same alert at more than one location. Furthermore, multiple subscribers can be notified of the same event. For example, an entire family can be simultaneously notified of voice mail messages left at their residential line. *Specification*, at pg. 7, line 20 – pg. 8, line 9.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the following combination of features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

a plurality of voice mail switches, wherein each voice mail switch is configured to receive an event and an identifier associated with the event; and

a notification server, coupled to the plurality of voice mail switches, that is configured to perform actions including:

obtaining a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers;

receiving an event and an identifier from at least one of the plurality of voice mail switches;

correlating the identifier associated with the event with the PUID that identifies the subscriber registered with the notification server;

generating an alert; and

sending the alert to the subscriber indicating that the event occurred.

Applicants assert that Porter does not teach the above combination of features. The Office Action states that "Porter's 'mailbox number' reads on the PUID." *Office Action*, at pg. 4. Porter teaches a system for remotely accessing a mailbox by the Internet. The user enters a URL of the voicemail system and the server associated with the URL sends a HTML file to the user as shown in FIGURE 4. The user then enters a mailbox number to access the mailbox. When the

user wants to access another mailbox associated with a different phone, the user must start the process over. Porter does not teach receiving message access and alerts from several message stores. In the system of Porter the user must access each store independently. The PUID recited in the claim is not the same as the mailbox number of Porter. Claim 1 specifically recites "obtaining a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers." For example, a first identifier might be associated with a home phone and a second identifier might be associated with a cell phone. Applicants can find no teaching in Porter of a PUID that identifies the subscriber and several identifiers. Applicants assert that the other cited references do not remedy the lack of teaching in Porter. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 1 is allowable over the references.

Independent claim 13 has been amended to include the following combination of features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

receiving an event and an identifier associated with the event at a one of a plurality of voice mail switches;

forwarding the event and the identifier to a notification server associated with a the plurality of voice mail switches;

generating, on the notification server, a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers;

correlating the identifier associated with the event with the PUID that identifies the subscriber registered with the notification server;

generating an alert; and

sending the alert to the subscriber indicating that the event occurred.

Applicants assert that the references do not teach the above combination of features. Claim 13 specifically recites "generating, on the notification server, a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers." As set forth above, the references

do not teach this limitation. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 13 is allowable over the references.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to include the following combination of features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

a means for receiving an event and an identifier associated with the event at one of a plurality of voice mail switches;

a means for forwarding the event and the identifier to a notification server associated with a plurality of voice mail switches;

a means for generating, on the notification server, a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers;

a means for correlating the identifier associated with the event with the PUID that identifies the subscriber registered with the notification server;

a means for generating an alert; and

a means for sending the alert to the subscriber indicating that the event occurred.

Applicants assert that the references do not teach the above combination of features. Claim 20 specifically recites "a means for generating, on the notification server, a personal unique identifier (PUID) that identifies a subscriber registered with the notification server and maps to a plurality of identifiers, wherein at least one of the plurality of identifiers is associated with a different voice mail switch than the other of the plurality of identifiers." As set forth above, the references do not teach this limitation. Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 20 is allowable over the references.

Claims 2-3, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16-17, 18 and 21 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 13 and 20. As such, those claims are thought allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

#### **IV. Request For Reconsideration**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application,

App. No. 10/679,819  
Amendment Dated: June 18, 2007  
Reply to Final Office Action of April 17, 2007

the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Ryan T. Grace  
Registration No. 52,956  
Direct Dial: 206.342.6258

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P. O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
206.342.6200

**27488**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE